

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,359	02/05/2004	John C. Hill	511-007	8409
39602	7590 04/21/2005		EXAMINER	
NOBLITT & GILMORE, LLC. 4800 NORTH SCOTTSDALE ROAD			HOWARD, SHARON LEE	
SUITE 6000	SCOTTSDALL ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCOTTSDAL	E, AZ 85251		1615	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/774,359	HILL ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Sharon L. Howard	1615				
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication r Reply	n appears on the cover shee	et with the correspondence a	ddress			
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by eply received by the Office later than three months after the d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, moon. a reply within the statutory minimum of seriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) statute, cause the application to become	ay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered tim MONTHS from the mailing date of this ne ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1/24/05,3/30/05.					
·	•	This action is non-final.					
•							
Dispositio	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-4,6,8-15 and 17-31 is/are penda) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4,6,8-15 and 17-31 is/are rejected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and papers	hdrawn from consideration.					
9)[] 1	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.					
•	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
٠,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the $lpha$ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	·	-, -				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ <i>F</i> a)□	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received i priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	in Application No een received in this Nationa	l Stage			
Attachment(. [
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Inform	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S No(s)/Mail Date	'	of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Art Unit: 1615

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4,6,8-15,17-31 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection. Receipt of the request for continued examination (RCE) and the response and amendment filed on 3/3/05 and the change of correspondence address filed on 1/24/05 have been acknowledged.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 31 have been currently amended. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-4,6,8-15,17-31 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,6,8-15,17-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaplan (USPN 5,047,232).

The reference teaches topical compositions consisting of jojoba oil, lanolin oil, coconut oil, olive oil, liquid lanolin and cottonseed oil which are suitable cosmetic

Application/Control Number: 10/774,359

Art Unit: 1615

emollients (see col.3, lines 49-54). Kaplan teaches semi-solid cosmetic emollients which include hydrogenated lanolin, petrolatum, isopropyl lanolate, butyl myristate, cetyl myristate, cetyl alcohol and isocetyl lanolate (see col.4, lines 12-20). The compositions may also contain dyes which can be defined as colorants, perfumes and antioxidants (see col.5, lines 22-24).

The reference does not teach the particular temperature.

However, absent a showing in the criticality of the particular temperature, there are no unexpected results since the prior art reference achieves the same result, a semi-solid emollient composition comprising jojoba oil

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,6,8-15,17-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent No. 4,286,609) in view of Arquette (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,530) and further in view of Nardolillo et al. (USPN 6,471,951B1).

Miller teaches a cuticle treatment composition known in the art for moisturizing the tissues surrounding the nail (see col.1, lines 21-35). Miller discloses using a bottle containing compositions for nail treatment which is known to be used as a hot oil treatment. Miller also teaches that the treatment involves using a cuticle stick which is cylindrical in shape (see col.2, lines 3-23). Miller teaches that the hot oil treatment uses

Art Unit: 1615

a concentration of animal and vegetable oils, proteins, vitamins and other ingredients. The animal and vegetable oils include corn, olive, cottonseed, sesame and coconut oils (see col.2, lines 24-37). Miller discloses a method for treating a cuticle using the emollients (see col.4, lines 32-63).

As for the teaching of extending the emollient composition past an opening in the container or extruding the emollient composition past the opening in the container, and replacing the cap on the container, one of ordinary skill in the art would know the suitable means to perform this function.

Miller does not particularly teach jojoba esters.

However, Arquette teaches an emollient composition which is used in cosmetic products, wherein the cosmetic products can be produced from fatty alcohols, isopropyl esters and wax esters, which can be obtained from jojoba oil. Arquette teaches jojoba wax esters (see col.4, lines 40-62). Arquette teaches that the emollient compositions may be used as emollient carriers (see col.7, lines 46-60). Arquette teaches fragrances, pigments, antimicrobial agents, antibacterial materials, pheromones, anti-inflammatory agents, sun blocks and sunscreens and insect repellants which may be combined with the emollient carrier (col.7, lines 46-60). Arquette discloses a process for making an emollient comprising the steps of a) providing a composition comprising jojoba oil, b) adding an alcohol to the said composition, c) effecting alcoholysis on said jojoba oil mixed with said alcohol to produce an emollient, and d) effecting interesterification of remaining wax esters (see col.8, lines 49-67, bridging col.9, lines 26).

Art Unit: 1615

Nardolillo is relied upon for the teaching of an eyebrow pencil containing wax bases such as jojoba wax, synthetic wax, including other traditional waxes, and fatty esters. Nardolillo teaches that the wax base composition typically contain an oil such as jojoba oil, which purpose is to soften the wax (see col.3, lines 23-54).

It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miller reference, to include jojoba esters and to include a container that retains the semi-solid emollient taught by Arquette and Nardolillo, having the reasonable expectation of obtaining a semi-solid emollient composition which comprises jojoba esters, known for the purpose of treating the cuticles and for moisturizing the tissues surrounding the nails, and one expect to achieve similar beneficial results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that quite simply, Kaplan does not teach or otherwise disclose a "cuticle treatment and conditioning composition", much less "a semi-solid emollient having esterified compounds at least partially derived from natural seed and nut oils". Irrespective of temperature ranges or additional compositional componenets, nowhere does Kaplan teach or disclose a "cuticle treatment and conditioning composition" in accordance with Applicant's claim 1 as amended. The combination of Arquette and Miller does not teach or suggest a "cuticle treatment and conditioning composition comprising a semi-solid emollient having esterified compounds as least partially derived from natural seed and nut oils" as set forth in claim 1 as amended.

Additionally, there is no motivation or suggestion to be found in either the Arquette or the Miller reference, nor in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Arquette or Miller or to combine either reference with each other, or any other reference of record, to practice the invention of claim 1 as amended. Applicants submit that the combination of Arquette and Miller does not teach or suggest a "product for treating cuticles comprising a semi-solid emollient and a container that retains the semi-solid emollient and enables the user to apply the emollient to a selected surface without the user having to touch the emollient with his/her finger tips" as set forth in claim 10. Specifically, the combination of Arquette with Miller does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a "product for treating cuticles comprising a semi-solid emollient and a container that retains the semi-solid emollient and enables the user to apply the emollient to a selected surface without the user having to touch the emollient with his/her finger tips" (emphasis added).

In response to applicant's arguments, applicant is claiming a cosmetic composition and the specific use is a future-intended use. There is motivation for combining the references, because one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine the suitable forms.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon L. Howard whose telephone number is (571) 272-0596. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/774,359 Page 7

Art Unit: 1615

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharon Howard

Shawn Howard

April 11, 2005

THURMAN K. PÅGE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGYÆRNTER 1600